



would result in dismissal of this case with prejudice.

Despite the explanation in the *Roseboro* Order, the Order of this Court dated August 28, 2008 [Doc. 27], and three extensions, the plaintiff did not respond to the motion to dismiss.

Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed *with prejudice* for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with this Court's orders, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir.1982). See *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989).

s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States Magistrate Judge

January 14, 2009

Greenville, South Carolina Carolina